

First Public Review Comments on BSR E1.37-4 with Comment Resolutions, Sorted by Comment Number

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
1	Nigrosh	0	00	General
Comment				
E137-4 Draft issue for Public Review Jan CPWG 2018				
<p>Conceptually, this document seems to be moving in the right direction. It is, however, hard to follow internally, and requires an amount of additional knowledge from other standards that are not referenced. This makes it very confusing to try to implement. I do not believe the document is ready to be published by ANSI at this time, but it is very exciting to see the approach towards a universal file transfer protocol. A separate set of comments with grammar and typesetting suggestions will follow, sent to the task group.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
2	Kearney	0	00	General
Comment				
<p>The FTC_VALIDATE and FTC_COMMIT messages seem to provide mostly duplicate information. Having two of them opens the door to unnecessary errors (for example, FTC_COMMIT's MODAL_ERROR and MISSING_VALIDATION are only necessary because of this dual-stage structure), and COMMIT has most of the same failure messages that VALIDATE has. It seems like they could be combined into a single stage (probably called COMMIT) that returns errors on failed validation.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
3	Kearney	0	00	General
Comment				
<p>Suggest requiring CRCs throughout as there is no real reason for them to be optional; a CRC is not difficult to implement.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
4	Kearney	0	00	General
Comment				
<p>The biggest functional issue ETC has with the document as it is now is the requirement for a responder to hold an entire new flash image in storage before writing it to code space. This is mentioned in varying forms in Sect. 6.2, Sect. 8 Par. 7, and Sect. 8.4 Par. 4. A common method for firmware upload of resource-constrained devices is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The device enters a firmware upload state, executed out of a protected code region. 2. The device accepts a new firmware image, erasing the non-protected application code flash immediately and re-writing the code flash as the firmware image file is received. 3. The device verifies the new image using a CRC or other method and stores the CRC. On the next boot, a valid CRC indicates that execution can be transferred to the new firmware image. Interruption of transfer causes an invalid CRC, which results in a failure mode of the device simply remaining in the firmware upload state and waiting for a new image. <p>This method makes it unnecessary to have enough RAM or flash to store the entire image at the same time before writing it to code space; this makes it very attractive to resource-constrained applications. The standard should not disallow this method; the text in Sect. 6.2, Sect. 8 Par. 7, and Sect. 8.4 should be changed or removed to allow this method.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
5	Blair	0	00	General
Comment				
<p>There should be a Normative References Section in this doc. That is typically Section 2. It needs to contain the [RDM], [PIDS-1], etc...</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
6	Blair	0	00	Text Fields
Comment				
<p>The document needs a section early on with the following: "x.x Text Field Handling Text fields shall conform to Section 10.1 in [RDM]."</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
7	Nigrosh	0	01	
Comment				
The document needs a section early on with the following: "x.x Text Field Handling Text fields shall conform to Section 10.1 in [RDM]."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
8	Newton	0	01	
Comment				
Remove the literal value "231". If anything this should be a cross reference to the E1.20 standard.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
9	Blair	0	01	
Comment				
"This document provides developers of RDM responder hardware with a standard means of implementing firmware upload..." This should be reworded.				
Suggest: "This document provides a standard means of implementing firmware upload..."				
Reason: The audience of this document is much wider than just RDM Responder HW manufacturers...don't turn a controller manufacturer away with the opening sentence.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
10	Blair	0	01	Introduction
Comment				
"...in order to ascertain the integrity of the data prior to committing the data and forcing a reload of responder firmware."				
Suggest changing to: "...in order to determine the integrity of the data before storing or utilizing it."				
Reason: clarity and making it more generic.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
11	Blair	0	01, last para.	
Comment				
"The method described herein is therefore referred to as File Transfer Control (FTC)". Suggest: "This process is referred throughout this document as 'File Transfer Control (FTC)'. " Reason: clarity, less wordy.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
12	Kearney	0	01	
Comment				
Missing period at end of last sentence.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
13	Newton	0	01.1	
Comment				
Strike this entire paragraph.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
14	Blair	0	01.1	
Comment				
This sentence is painful to read and this section really isn't needed. I would suggest adding a sentence to the Intro or Scope sections using similar text that we have used in other E1.37 docs that simply state it is a set of message extensions to the E1.20 standard.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
15	Nigrosh	0	01.2	
Comment				
<p>There appear to be many terms missing from this definition section. Most importantly, we don't know what "controller" and "responder" are. They may need to be referenced from the [RDM] document.</p> <p>* To resurrect the ongoing battle: we don't know how large a "byte" is. Consider defining it here, or using the more accurate term "octet."</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
16	Blair	0	01.2	Terminology
Comment				
Change "collection" to "transfer" for consistency.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
17	Newton	0	02	
Comment				
Strike the third paragraph. The standard isn't the place to describe tradeoffs in the design.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
18	Blair	0	02	
Comment				
<p>"minimizes" is spelled incorrectly for an AMERICAN National Standard :)</p> <p>[TSM note: Both "minimises" and "minimizes" can be found in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary; either is valid. There is no requirement for a preferred spelling in American National Standards, either from ANSI or ESTA. The CPWG can choose to enforce particular spelling conventions, but this can lead to lengthy discussion about the intended audience and subtexts—generally become a serious time-soak. ESTA's journal, Protocol, has evolved its editorial policy to accept British and US spellings as being equally valid.]</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
19	Blair	0	02	
Comment				
<p>Our use of "PID" is actually slang for "Parameter Message" or "Message" as it should be stated in the document. PID technically refers to the ID value itself and not the message even though in the TG we commonly refer to it as that. If you search through 1.37-7 for example you will only see PID used to refer to the ID value itself.</p> <p>Change: All instances of PID should correctly say "Parameter Message" to be consistent with E1.20 and other E1.37 docs.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
20	Blair	0	02	
Comment				
<p>last sentence in () should be removed. This totally depends on the implementation. I can implement PIDs in a manner that does not really require additional code space and this statement really adds nothing useful in terms of implementing what is defined in the doc.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
21	Newton	0	03	
Comment				
<p>"This section". What section? If isn't all of section 3 this should be marked in the title e.g. 3 Overview [INFORMATIVE]</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
22	Newton	0	03	
Comment				
<p>Again don't quote the limit of 231 bytes.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
23	Newton	0	03	
Comment				
"This design uses new Parameter ID's (PIDs) as extensions to the [RDM] PID list". Not required, remove.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
24	Newton	0	03	
Comment				
"These PIDs are used to control all aspects of Firmware or File Upload to a responder, and are the only PIDs required to support Firmware or File uploads." . Which PIDS? The text makes it sound like all PIDs in the document are required, but then the next paragraph discusses optional PIDs. Perhaps just remove all of this text?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
25	Nigrosh	0	03	
Comment				
<p>There seem like there are some terms from the RDM document that are referenced here (for example, Parameter IDs from E1.20 6.2.10.2, or Proxy Devices from E1.20 8).</p> <p>It would also be helpful to provide forward references for the portions of this standard that this section speaks about.</p> <p>It is mentioned in the opening of section 3 that this is informative. How much of section 3 does that apply to?</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
26	Blair	0	03, first sentence	
Comment				
'summarize' is spelled incorrectly for an AMERICAN National Standard :) [TSM note: "Summarise" and "summarize" can both be found in Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, which is billed by the publisher as "America's best-selling dictionary." Either is valid. There is no rule that a particular spelling must be used in American National Standard.]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
27	Blair	0	03, first sentence	
Comment				
Needs rewording. It feels overly wordy and clumsy to read. Suggest: "This section summarizes FTC operation of how a controller sends a file (firmware or other), to a responder. It also summarizes the means by which a controller may request the Download of file data from a responder."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
28	Blair	0	03	
Comment				
Change payload/packet to "payload per packet" for readability.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
29	Blair	0	03, para 2	
Comment				
"The basic [RDM] specification determines the maximum payload/packet that may be sent as 231 bytes." Suggest: "The [RDM] specification sets the maximum payload per packet that may be sent as 231 bytes." Reason: readability, simplicity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
30	Kearney	0	03, para 5	
Comment				
Suggest the use of the term "Parameter Message(s)" instead of "PID(s)" throughout the document to refer to an RDM parameter message. This is the term E1.20 uses and it helps to draw the distinction between the parameter message as a whole and the field within the message header that is used to identify the message (PID).				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
31	Blair	0	03	
Comment				
multiple occurrences of 'PID' See comment #7. [Comment numbering is Blair's, and not relevant to this document. His "7" is a comment regarding "PID" use in clause 2.]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
32	Kearney	0	03	
Comment				
The last three paragraphs are not clear on which new PIDs are required for what. Suggested new text to improve clarity: "This standard introduces a new set of Parameter IDs (PIDs) as extensions to the [RDM] PID list. Four PIDs provide the core support for File Transfer Control. These core PIDs are the only ones required to implement Firmware or File Upload transfers. "To support File Download transfers, additional PIDs are required which facilitate declaration of details related to file naming, file type and file access."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
33	Newton	0	03.1	
Comment				
Contains "shall" statements, but the text above states this section is informative.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
34	Blair	0	03.1	Use of Broadcast Message Transfers
Comment				
Why do we allow responders to not receive data via broadcast upload? This just adds more complexity to the implementation for controllers to have to handle different cases and creates a situation where you have an incompatibility because the fixture only supports one means and the controller may only support the other. This reduces chances of interoperability. This restriction should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
35	Blair	0	03.1, para 3	Use of Broadcast Message Transfers
Comment				
It is unclear what you are trying to describe here. If you are talking about the CRC checksum it would be clearer to just state that. If it is something else then it is unclear what you are referring to.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
36	Kearney	0	03.1, para 3	
Comment				
The reference to GET:FTC_VALIDATE here should be GET:FTC_NEGOTIATE. That is the message that returns the last data offset.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
37	Blair	0	03.2	
Comment				
"DMX/RDM" Mitch will come hunt you down for not properly stating as "DMX512/RDM". Multiple occurrences				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
38	Newton	0	03.2	
Comment				
"Controllers issuing commands as 1:1 transfers using this protocol would expect ". Change "would" to "should". we can't tell what the controllers will do.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
39	Blair	0	03.2	
Comment				
I am unclear as to what the implication of "would" means. It believe you meant to use "should".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
40	Blair	0	03.2	
Comment				
para 2 should come after para 3. Para 2 is confusing and out of context until you read the following para.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
41	Kearney	0	03.2	
Comment				
Colon at end of last sentence should be period				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
42	Blair	0	03.3 [4.6]	Master Control [Cancellation of Transfe
Comment				
Suggest changing "session" to "FTC session" for clarity since there really is no concept of "sessions" in RDM.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
43	Newton	0	03.3	
Comment				
"Master Control" appears only here. "Master" occurs 3 times in E1.20 and I don't think any of those apply here. If this means something specific then it needs to be defined.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
44	Blair	0	03.4	
Comment				
It is helpful for all Section, Appendix, Table references to be linked as bookmarks so you can jump to them in the PDF by clicking on them.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
45	Nigrosh	0	03.4	
Comment				
Transfer times: The example calculation appears to be in Appendix F, and not Appendix E as stated here				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
46	Newton	0	04	File Requirements
Comment				
It feels like many of the "recommendations" here should be moved outside the standard, as a white paper or protocol article. If it doesn't relate to the correctness of the transfer protocol it doesn't belong here. This document provides a mechanism for transfer, how manufacturers use that is up to them.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
47	Kearney	0	04	File Requirements
Comment				
This section should be marked Informative because it contains only informative statements and recommendations (other than the "binary format" requirement from the [4.2] comment)				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
48	Newton	0	04?	
Comment				
The text discussing what's in scope should be moved to the scope section.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
49	Blair	0	04.2	
Comment				
Remove the requirement for data to be in a "binary format". This is not always true and doesn't need to be a requirement. You could easily send firmware files as an S19 format across the wire which is by definition ASCII. There are also plenty of other file types you might send that are not strictly binary.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
50	Kearney	0	04.2	
Comment				
The requirement that a file contain data "in binary format" is unclear. Does this mean text files are not allowed? What if an implementation finds it more convenient to represent firmware using Intel HEX or S-record? This requirement should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
51	Blair	0	04.2.1	
Comment				
Header style appears very odd for level 3. Suggest following the Word header and ToC styles used in the other E1.20/E1.37 family docs.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
52	Newton	0	04.3	
Comment				
The text discussing what's in scope should be moved to the scope section.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
53	Nigrosh	0	04.3	
Comment				
File Compatibility: What does "Manufacturers who elect to encode this information into the first 16 bytes of their files may benefit from efficiencies to be had in the use of this standard." mean? Is it possible to explain this a bit more, or reference some other part of the standard? A complete read of the standard did not yield any more knowledge of the magical efficiencies.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
54	Blair	0	04.3	
Comment				
"It is recommended that the information required to determine that the data is suitable for the target responder (by make, model and version or other method as chosen by the responder manufacturer) is contained in the first few packets transferred." Suggest: "It is recommended that the information required to determine suitability for the target responder is contained in the first few file packets transferred. This might include information such as make, model and version or other details as chosen by the responder manufacturer." Reason: Readability.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
55	Blair	0	04.3, para 3	
Comment				
I'd suggest deleting this. You've already stated the reasons for encoding the data in the first few packets only to then suggest further limiting it to first 16 bytes. Leave it up to the implementor. Or pick a single suggested implementation, but the first 16 bytes feels very overly limited. If you have a very low capacity responder then you should just expect low capacity performance.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
56	Blair	0	04.4, para 1	
Comment				
This needs to be more clear you are talking about the overall file contents and not a per transaction so it isn't confused with the 2nd para which would appear to be contradictory. It should also state the reason for including a CRC or checksum in the file itself to prevent for disassembly/assembly errors of the entire file at each end which can't be protected against by the packet CRC.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
57	Blair	0	05.1, para 1	
Comment				
I believe this needs to be a SHALL and not a should for ACK_TIMER support and probably QUEUED_MESSAGE in controllers.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
58	Kearney	0	05.2, para 1	
Comment				
I cannot make sense of this requirement. Which file data a controller accepts or does not accept for transfer should not be within the scope of this standard (as is implied by the very next paragraph). This paragraph should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
59	Newton	0	05.1	
Comment				
It says "should provide support for ACK_TIMER" but then the next paragraph says "demand". Change the "should" to a "shall".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
60	Kearney	0	05.2	
Comment				
This section is a bit long; it would benefit from being split into three sections, one that covers requirements for both 1:1 and 1:many transfers, and then two more for requirements specific to 1:1 and 1:many.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
61	Blair	0	05.2	Functional Requirements
Comment				
"The method of determining the existence of Proxy Devices is beyond the scope of this standard." You've made numerous references to having to account for them so you can't ignore how they are discovered. There needs to be appropriate references here to sections in E1.20 to address how it is done.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
62	Kearney	0	05.2	
Comment				
The RDM standard includes a method for determining the existence of Proxy Devices; this should be mentioned here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
63	Newton	0	05.2	
Comment				
"This standard does not specify the format of any file generated by a manufacturer for a particular responder". This is a repeat of what's stated in section 4.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
64	Newton	0	05.2	
Comment				
"transfers may [if desired]" - remove the [if desired], this is implied by "may".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
65	Nigrosh	0	05.2	
Comment				
<p>Paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 of this section are confusing, and could be considered to be addressed by the third paragraph in this section. Consider removing them, making them more generic and providing a forward reference, or keeping them specific and providing forward references for each term.</p> <p>It seems as though paragraph 10 and 11 belong in the section where these sizes are described (currently section 6, though I believe this should be moved out of the "Responder Requirements" section and given its own)</p> <p>paragraphs 12, 13, and 14 would fit better in the areas where each of these messages is defined</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
66	Kearney	0	05.2, para 10	
Comment				
This paragraph is confusing here, because it comes before the notion of sessions has been introduced. It's also less prescriptive than Section 6.4.5, which explicitly requires that Controllers group Responders according to Max Block Size and Accumulated Packet Count. Suggest just removing the paragraph here because it is covered later.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
67	Kearney	0	05.2, para 13	
Comment				
Suggest changing the beginning of this paragraph to: 'A responder may, at any point during a 1:1 transfer...', since responders won't respond in the middle of a 1:many transfer.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
68	Blair	0	05.2, last para	
Comment				
'session' is missing ending quote and should refer to them as 'FTC session' for clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
69	Blair	0	05.2, last para	
Comment				
'utilizing' is not spelled correctly for an ANSI standard. [TSM note: "Utilising" and "utilizing" both can be found in many standard dictionaries. Either is a valid spelling, but ESTA's Manual of Style, Strunk and White's Elements of Style, and the Chicago Manual of Style, 17th edition, all would recommend "using" rather than "utilizing." "Utilizing" is a poor word choice, however spelled.]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
70	Kearney	0	05.2	
Comment				
The last two paragraphs are part of the same thought and should be combined.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
71	Kearney	0	05.2	
Comment				
last paragraph: There is a stray ' before the word "session"				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
72	Kearney	0	05.2	
Comment				
last paragraph: This being an ANSI standard, I think the American spelling of "utilizing" should be... utilized. :) [TSM note: ESTA's Manual of Style, Strunk and White's Elements of Style, and the Chicago Manual of Style, 17th edition, all would recommend "using" rather than "utilizing." "Utilizing" is a poor word choice, however spelled.]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
73	Newton	0	06 [9]	Responder Requirements
Comment				
"There are some minimum requirements that should be facilitated by responders to reliably use the transfer scheme detailed in this document. Responder manufacturers shall observe the following points to ensure the integrity of their products during any firmware upload process." - remove this text - just state the requirements rather than "responders need to observe these requirements".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
74	Blair	0	06.1, para 2	
Comment				
It is totally unclear what you are trying to say here. Are you talking about in the event of a failure the boot loader must support FTC?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
75	Nigrosh	0	06.1 [9.1]	
Comment				
To whom or what, and via what mechanism is the manufacturer declaring the risk to their responder if it does not have the ability to resume a "stable or known state" in the case of error, loss of data, or failure? Is this a message in this standard?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
76	Newton	0	06.1	
Comment				
"a stable or known state " is not defined. A "stable, known state" may be "not working" which is probably not the intent of this statement. Unless we're going to define this state we should remove this text.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
77	Blair	0	06.2	
Comment				
It should be 'and/or'.				
[TSM note: The 'and/or' construction is not good writing. It was called out in ANSI's style guide as an example of bad writing, and warning against it is included in ESTA's own style guide. (See clause 4.2.4 in ESTA's Manual of Style, available at http://tsp.esta.org/tsp/documents/procedural_docs.html .) The Chicago Manual of Style, 17th edition, also says, "Avoid this Janus-faced term," in section 5.250, Glossary of Problematic Words and Phrases. Strunk and White in The Elements of Style, 3rd edition, call it, "A device, or short-cut, that damages a sentence and often leads to confusion or ambiguity." Any of these references can be consulted for advice on a better expression.]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
78	Blair	0	06.2	
Comment				
I get what is being said here but it needs to be a bit more generic as there are many implementations that vary in how the same base requirement can be achieved. For example, literal interpretation of this says that I have to keep it all in RAM, but I might have multiple operating firmware sections and I store the data as I receive it and only after the verify/commit stage do I flip a bit as to which section gets booted from. That active operating sector flag could be stored in an EEPROM and not even in Flash. This section just needs to be more generic about the requirements and not specific implementations. The requirement is simply that "the updated firmware should be utilized until after data integrity and commit operations have been performed."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
79	Blair	0	06.3	
Comment				
Section header. "Behavior" does not have the correct spelling..				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
80	Kearney	0	06.3, para 1	
Comment				
'Shall' should not be used when not imposing a prescriptive requirement on a standard implementation. Suggest rephrase to 'A responder may limit or stop...'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
81	Nigrosh	0	06.4 [9.4]	Responder Declarations.
Comment				
Responder Declarations. I believe this subsection should be moved to its own section, as it is deviating from "Responder Requirements" and beginning to define properties.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
82	Blair	0	06.4.1	
Comment				
[] are often used in text in this document where () would normally be used grammatically. "[Valid range is 16-224]". In this case it is just a random fragment. The valid range should be completely spelled out. Suggest: "The valid range for Max Block Size is from 16-224 bytes."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
83	Blair	0	06.4.1, para 3	
Comment				
"This" should be stated as "Max Block Size".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
84	Blair	0	06.4.1	
Comment				
4th and 5th para should be flipped for readability.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
85	Kearney	0	06.4.1, para 4	
Comment				
Extra space before [RDM], missing 'the': 'within <the> payload of each transfer packet'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
86	Kearney	0	06.4.1, para 6	
Comment				
Missing space between '16' and 'bytes'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
87	Blair	0	last paragraph	Max Block Size (8-bit)
Comment				
<p>Why is this stated? Why is there deference to small responders? I suggest this needs paragraph just be removed as it isn't a needed. Otherwise it needs to be completely reworded to match what is actually trying to be said. We are not limiting the Block Size, we are limiting the minimum end of the range of the Max Block Size... If anything we should be encouraging people to use the largest block size they can, but this almost reads otherwise currently.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
88	Newton	0	06.4.1	
Comment				
<p>"The 224 byte limitation is derived from (i) the maximum payload of 231 bytes defined in [RDM], and (ii) the use of a small header within payload of each transfer packet." Again don't explain how we got the value.</p> <p>"The transfer protocol defined in this standard requires a small header in each packet as part of the Parameter Data. " - remove this, see the comment above.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
89	Newton	0	.4.1 - 6.4.7 [9.4	
Comment				
All literal values here should be moved to constants in an Appendix.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
90	Blair	0	06.4.2, para 1	
Comment				
this needs to be spelled out as a complete sentence starting with the field name. "The Initial Delay time is...."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
91	Newton	0	06.4.2	
Comment				
Reference the 176us to the E1.20 standard rather than copying the value here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
92	Nigrosh	0	06.4.2	
Comment				
Initial Delay Time (16 bit) How is the controller polling responders to acquire this information? Is there a reference missing?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
93	Blair	0	06.4.2, para 2	
Comment				
same as comment #38 and #34. [Comment number is irrelevant to this summary. He wrote: "this needs to be spelled out as a complete sentence starting with the field name. "The Initial Delay time is...." and "[] are often used in text in this document where () would normally be used grammatically. "[Valid range is 16-224]". In this case it is just a random fragment. The valid range should be completely spelled out. Suggest: "The valid range for Max Block Size is from 16-224 bytes."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
94	Blair	0	06.4.2, para 3	
Comment				
Shouldn't start para with "This". Same as comment # 35. [Blair"s numbering, which is irrelevant to this summary document. His comment #35 is: "This" should be stated as "Max Block Size".]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
95	Newton	0	06.4.3	
Comment				
Reference the 176us to the E1.20 standard rather than copying the value here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
96	Blair	0	06.4.3	
Comment				
same as comment #38. [Blair's comment #38 said, "this needs to be spelled out as a complete sentence starting with the field name. "The Initial Delay time is...."]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
97	Blair	0	06.4.3	
Comment				
same as comment #39. [Blair's comment #39 said "same as comment #38 and #34." Comment 38 said, "this needs to be spelled out as a complete sentence starting with the field name. "The Initial Delay time is...." Comment 34 said, "[] are often used in text in this document where () would normally be used grammatically. "[Valid range is 16-224]". In this case it is just a random fragment. The valid range should be completely spelled out. Suggest: "The valid range for Max Block Size is from 16-224 bytes."]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
98	Blair	0	06.4.3	
Comment				
same as comment #40. [Blair's comment 40 said, "Shouldn't start para with "This". Same as comment # 35." His comment 35 said, ""This" should be stated as "Max Block Size".]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
99	Blair	0	06.4.3	
Comment				
"Responders shall acknowledge the request before commencement of any internal operation that is the reason for requiring the delay." I have no idea what this means or how it is supposed to acknowledge it...				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
100	Kearney	0	06.4.3	
Comment				
'Responders shall acknowledge the request': What request? Should be changed to 'shall acknowledge the SET:FTC_TRANSFER message' or similar.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
101	Kearney	0	06.4.4	
Comment				
This section should include a Valid Range for consistency with the other sections.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
102	Blair	0	06.4.4	
Comment				
Same as comment #34. [Blair's comment 34 said, "[] are often used in text in this document where () would normally be used grammatically. "[Valid range is 16-224]". In this case it is just a random fragment. The valid range should be completely spelled out. Suggest: "The valid range for Max Block Size is from 16-224 bytes."]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
103	Blair	0	06.4.5, para 3	
Comment				
3rd para (and throughout entire doc). Times should always be stated with capital 'S'. It should be mS and not ms. Same with uS.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
104	Newton	0	06.4.5	
Comment				
".. longest declared Inter-packet Delay ", Change "longest" to maximum				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
105	Blair	0	06.4.5	
Comment				
same as comment #40. [Blair's comment #40 said, "Shouldn't start para with "This". Same as comment # 35." Blair's comment 35 said, "'This" should be stated as "Max Block Size".']				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
106	Blair	0	06.4.6 para 1	
Comment				
same as comment #34. [Blair's comment 34 said, '['] are often used in text in this document where () would normally be used grammatically. "[Valid range is 16-224]". In this case it is just a random fragment. The valid range should be completely spelled out. Suggest: "The valid range for Max Block Size is from 16-224 bytes."']				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
107	Blair	0	06.4.6, para 2	
Comment				
same as comment #35 [Blair's comment 35 said, "'This' should be stated as 'Max Block Size'".]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
108	Blair	0	06.4.6, para 1	
Comment				
time should always be capital 'S' when abbreviated.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
109	Kearney	0	06.4.6	
Comment				
Surely the unit here is not supposed to be seconds. I think this is a typo, since the Commit Delay unit is listed as ms in all other locations where it appears.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
110	Blair	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
There needs to be forward references to explain what all these fields mean since this is the first any of them are encountered in the document and it is confusing stating requirements for setting a bit when none of these have been defined yet. Consider adding sub-sections defining each of these different bits here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
111	Newton	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
"Set if responder does not accept E1.37-X as broadcast messages". Change to E1.37-4				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
112	Kearney	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
Bits 4 and 5 should be swapped here, to fit with the previous pattern of 'upload behavior' followed by 'download behavior'.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
113	Kearney	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
Bit descriptions - harmonize on either period or no period at the end of each description.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
114	Kearney	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
Bit 5: Remove period after FileCRC				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
115	Kearney	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
Bit 6's description should say 'NULL START Code' instead of 'NullStartCcode'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
116	Kearney	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
Bit 10: Stray period before 'Set'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
117	Kearney	0	06.4.7	
Comment				
This should specifically call out the LOCK_STATE PID in E1.37-1 for clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
118	Blair	0	06.4.7, Bit 12	
Comment				
What is E1.37-X? Is this supposed to be E1.37-4? Again, there needs to be references explaining where this is explained in the doc.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
119	Blair	0	07	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
120	Kearney	0	07, para 1	
Comment				
Par. 1: Extra space before [RDM]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
121	Kearney	0	07, para 2	
Comment				
Add comma after 'as defined in [RDM]'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
122	Nigrosh	0	08	
Comment				
Operational Overview This appears to be a guide to the upcoming sections. It seems like this is the place for some commentary about the sequence of events in a transfer. It may also make sense to lay this out more like a map, and show where further information about each of these PIDs appears. A nod to Appendix B, with all of its examples, may also be helpful.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
123	Kearney	0	08, para 1	
Comment				
Suggest addition of 'FTC' for clarity: 'The FTC_NEGOTIATE PID shall be used to set up the FTC operation.'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
124	Newton	0	08	
Comment				
I'd suggest moving this section further up the document. Overall as currently written it's hard to follow. For example there is a detailed discussion of timing parameters before the general upload process is described. My suggested ordering:				
Introduction				
Scope				
Limitations				
General Overview of the Process - expand section 3 with a flowchart or diagram ?				
1:1 process				
1:many process				
Introduce block size, delays etc. without going into the details of the permitted values.				
Negotiation of Timing Parameters				
Use of Broadcast				
PID descriptions				
Within the FTC_NEGOTIATE section describe the permitted values.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
125	Newton	0	08 [10]	
Comment				
There are unnecessary "shalls" in the section. For instance "Transfer of file data shall use the FTC_TRANSFER PID." - This doesn't add anything , does this mean there is another way to transfer data ?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
126	Blair	0	08	
Comment				
Same as comment #53. multiple instances. [Blair's comment #53 said, ""PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments."]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
127	Kearney	0	08, para 6	
Comment				
We don't really have the notion of RDM Controllers "supporting" PIDs in other RDM standards, just Responders. Thus the implication of the 'Required' column in Table A-1 is 'Required by Responders' and this paragraph should probably just say 'Responder support...!.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
128	Blair	0	08 [10]	
Comment				
There needs to be a flowchart that illustrates the process and relationship of the messages. It is quite confusing reading individual message details and requirements everywhere without any kind of flowchart that ties it all together. This should have occurred much earlier in the document.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
129	Blair	0	08	
Comment				
<p>"When the transfer data is intended as replacement firmware for the responder, the commit stage initiates responder reprogramming/re-flashing of code space." This is too implementation specific. See comment #32. [Blair's comment 32 said, 'I get what is being said here but it needs to be a bit more generic as there are many implementations that vary in how the same base requirement can be achieved. For example, literal interpretation of this says that I have to keep it all in RAM, but I might have multiple operating firmware sections and I store the data as I receive it and only after the verify/commit stage do I flip a bit as to which section gets booted from. That active operating sector flag could be stored in an EEPROM and not even in Flash.. This section just needs to be more generic about the requirements and not specific implementations. The requirement is simply that "the updated firmware should be utilized until after data integrity and commit operations have been performed."'</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
130	Blair	0	08	
Comment				
<p>If FTC_PROXY_NEGOTIATE is optional then how does 1:many work if it is not supported? It seems like it should be required for FTC operation otherwise it seems like an interoperability hole if a controller is only trying to use 1:many since that would seem to be allowed.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
131	Kearney	0	08	
Comment				
Remove extra 'PID' before 'FTC_PROXY_NEGOTIATE'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
132	Blair	0	08.1	
Comment				
This entire para was already stated elsewhere in the document, instead of re-stating in entirety it should be referenced or stated more briefly in one of the locations.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
133	Nigrosh	0	08.1	
Comment				
Negotiate Transfer Maybe merge this text with the actual PID description?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
134	Blair	0	08.2	
Comment				
why is [hardware] in []? This is confusing and not clearly stated.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
135	Newton	0	08.2	
Comment				
I'm not sure this standard should make any mention of hardware page sizes. They are a design consideration - it's not up to the standard to explain the relationship between blocks and pages - that's an implementation detail. At most this should be in a follow up white paper.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
136	Newton	0	08.2 [10.3]	Transfer File Data
Comment				
"Failure or interruption of the data transfer process, or corruption of data shall not in any way affect the subsequent operational integrity of the responder." - This sentence should be in section 6.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
137	Nigrosh	0	08.2	
Comment				
Transfer File Data Maybe merge this text with the actual PID description?				
Consider changing the first phrase to "Files shall be uploaded to the responder by the controller (or downloaded from the responder by the controller)."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
138	Kearney	0	08.2	
Comment				
'hardware' should not be in brackets here as brackets are used for references. Suggest just removing the brackets as that is how it is used in the previous paragraph.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
139	Newton	0	08.2 para 4	
Comment				
This has already been stated at least once elsewhere. Why is it restated again here?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
140	Blair	0	08.2	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
141	Nigrosh	0	08.3	
Comment				
Validate File Data Maybe merge this text with the actual PID description?				
The first paragraph is confusing. Perhaps change it to "Responders shall provide a means for a controller to verify the suitability and integrity of the uploaded data. On successful validation of uploaded data, responders shall maintain the integrity of the data until either the commit stage is completed, or the transfer process is re-initiated."				
Second paragraph should be re-written to state "Responders unable to provide an immediate validation result shall return an ACK packet with a Response Code of FTC_RS_ACKWAIT, instead of beginning an ACK_TIMER sequence."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
142	Blair	0	08.3, para 1	
Comment				
2nd sentence Needs re-wording for clarity and simplicity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
143	Blair	0	08.3 para 2	
Comment				
Suggest rewording more as cause and effect. "If a responder is unable....then it shall...."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
144	Blair	0	08.3	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
145	Blair	0	08.3, last para	
Comment				
This should be a SHALL requirement for 1:many.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
146	Nigrosh	0	08.4 [10.5]	Commit File Data
Comment				
Commit File Data Maybe merge this text with the actual PID description? In the second paragraph, by what mechanism shall the controllers perform this poll? When a responder rejects a commit, what does it do with any data it has collected?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
147	Kearney	0	08.4, para 1 & 2	
Comment				
The requirement to poll for successful completion is a 'shall' for 1:1 transfers, but a 'should' for 1:many. However, a few paragraphs down, responders are instructed to reject any COMMIT message if they have not received a VALIDATE. If responders abide by this requirement, that means sending VALIDATE to each responder is absolutely necessary in all cases for a successful transfer. So, the 'should' in paragraph 2 should be a 'shall'.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
148	Blair	0	8.4, para 2 [10.5	
Comment				
This should be a SHALL requirement for 1:many				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
149	Blair	0	8.4, para 4 [10.5	
Comment				
It is unclear if this is a requirement or not.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
150	Kearney	0	08.4, para 5 & 6	
Comment				
Remove duplicate paragraph.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
151	Blair	0	08.4	
Comment				
What is the reject mechanism being referenced here. what NACK code gets used?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
152	Kearney	0	08.4, end	
Comment				
Missing period at end of last sentence				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
153	Nigrosh	0	08.5	
Comment				
Resuming Communications This seems like it would be better suited as a subsection of 8.4				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
154	Kearney	0	09,10,11	
Comment				
It seems like these topics are too small to be top-level sections. Maybe they should all be grouped under 'Operational Overview' or another top-level section that indicates functional requirements.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
155	Newton	0	09	
Comment				
I'd combine Sections 9 & 10. It's a lot of the same text and it's not immediately clear that the difference is that 9 is the FileCRC whereas 10 is the Param Data CRC. I'd suggest: Specify the CRC State where it is used (both fileCRC and PD)				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
156	Karlsson	0	09, para 3 & 4	
Comment				
This requirement is covered by Sect. 6.1 of [RDM], which specifies big-endian transmission for 'all multi-byte data'. It doesn't need to be reproduced here, especially since it's not reproduced for any other multi-byte fields mentioned in this document. These paragraphs and Table 9-1 should be removed. The document-wide implication is that since RDM is the message transport used to implement this standard, the endianness rules (and other packet formatting rules) from [RDM] all apply here; it might be prudent to add a specific statement to that effect early in the standard.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
157	Blair	0	09	
Comment				
Forward reference issue. FileCRC referenced earlier in doc with no explanation or reference until we get down here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
158	Blair	0	09	
Comment				
"Where mention is made of FileCRC in this standard, the following implementation shall be followed." Suggest: "References to FileCRC used in this standard shall use the following implementation" Reason: simplicity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
159	Blair	0	09	
Comment				
Appendix references need to use bookmarks in Word to be linked in PDF.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
160	Blair	0	09, Table 9-1	
Comment				
Looks like wrong Style is used for Table 9-1 caption as it is larger than any other text and appears in the ToC too.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
161	Blair	0	10	
Comment				
We have just duplicated all the CRC text again. There should be one Section for CRC that defines how CRC works using common language and then sub-sections for FileCRC. We shouldn't be duplicating all the text though.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
162	Kearney	0	10	
Comment				
References to 'CRC' in this section should be replaced with 'PacketCRC' to provide symmetry with the use of 'FileCRC' in the previous section.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
163	Newton	0	10	Use of CRC
Comment				
"Controllers shall attempt to use data obtained from responders that do not support CRC " - The sentence is clumsy - change to "Controllers may use data obtained from responders ..."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
164	Nigrosh	0	10	
Comment				
Use of CRC The second paragraph in this section is a repetition of the second paragraph in section 9.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
165	Blair	0	10	Use of CRC
Comment				
Table reference is incorrect. Should be 9-1 instead of 9.1 and should be linked in Word.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
166	Blair	0	10, last para	Use of CRC
Comment				
Why would this need to get reported to the user?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
167	Newton	0	11	Use of SessionID
Comment				
This should be towards the top where the process is described.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
168	Newton	0	11	Use of SessionID
Comment				
"SessionIDs provide several benefits:" - strike this. We don't need to explain or justify why there is a session ID. If specific behavior is required then call that out in the other sections.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
169	Newton	0	11	
Comment				
"This standard does not support the simultaneous use of multiple file transfers to an individual responder. " - move this to the limitations section.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
170	Blair	0	11	
Comment				
What does not re-using SessionID's mean. Is this for concurrent uploads or in the case of a repeated upload? When can it re-use? Should it increment the SessionID for each session created and then just roll over to 0? That might be less ambiguous.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
171	Blair	0	11	Use of SessionID
Comment				
2nd example is unclear.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
172	Blair	0	11	Use of SessionID
Comment				
Section 11: What does not re-using SessionID's mean. Is this for concurrent uploads or in the case of a repeated upload? When can it re-use? Should it increment the SessionID for each session created and then just roll over to 0? That might be less ambiguous.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
173	Nigrosh	0	11	Use of SessionID
Comment				
Use of SessionID It seems like controllers should avoid reusing session IDs over some short period of time, but the guidance given here makes it seem like they should try NEVER to reuse them. There aren't that many, so it seems like repeats will happen. It may make sense to provide an algorithm (like the sequence number information in E1.31) that will help avoid collisions. Kevin might say we could also make them monotonically increasing by one. How is a "responder that has been relocated onto another physical data link that is in the process of transferring file data" any different as respects the SessionID? This bullet point can be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
174	Blair	0	12	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
175	Blair	0	12	
Comment				
What PID's define what a FileID means? They should be referenced here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
176	Blair	0	12	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
177	Newton	0	13	Replies from Responders
Comment				
Move the first four paragraphs to their respective PIDs. Otherwise the information on what responses are valid is in multiple places in the document.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
178	Blair	0	13	Replies from Responders
Comment				
This section is actually confusing. This details would be better stated within the individual PID's you are referencing here rather than trying to state specific details for different PIDs here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
179	Newton	0	13	Replies from Responders
Comment				
It feels as if "Response Status and Response Data" was an attempt at embedding another packet header within the Param Data. In section 15 there is a lot of duplication of error handling text. I feel like this could be improved if the error conditions were described separately and then for each PID the list of permitted response statuses was listed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
180	Kearney	0	13.2 para 2	
Comment				
Suggest changing this text to 'Responders shall set the Response Data field to 0xFFFF to indicate that the time declared during the Negotiate stage shall be used.' for clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
181	Nigrosh	0	13	Replies from Responders
Comment				
Replies from Responders This still seems like it is in the wrong order. Defining the PIDs before their constituent parts would make things much less confusing. The first segment of this section (preceding 13.1) could be removed, as that information can be gleaned from the PID descriptions.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
182	Blair	0	13.1	
Comment				
The Section title should include the Field name. i.e. Response Status ACKOK				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
183	Blair	0	13.2	
Comment				
Same as comment #83. [Blair's comment #83 is: "The Section title should include the Field name. i.e. Response Status ACKOK"]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
184	Blair	0	13.2	
Comment				
0xFFFF should be a define.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
185	Blair	0	13.2	
Comment				
utilizing" not spelled correctly. multiple instances.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
186	Kearney	0	13.2	
Comment				
See previous comment regarding 'utilizing'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
187	Blair	0	13.3	
Comment				
same as comment #83. [Blair's comment #83 is: "The Section title should include the Field name. i.e. Response Status ACKOK"]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
188	Blair	0	13.3	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
189	Kearney	0	13.3 [14.1.3]	Bad Response - attempt recovery
Comment				
All possible error types in each of these categories should be listed here for clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
190	Blair	0	13.4	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
191	Kearney	0	13.4 [14.1.4]	Fatal Errors
Comment				
All possible error types in each of these categories should be listed here for clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
192	Newton	0	14	Limitations
Comment				
This should be at the beginning - near the scope section not buried in section 14.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
193	Kearney	0	14	
Comment				
These comments seem out-of-place at this point in the standard. They should at the very least be moved earlier, perhaps to near the beginning. They also seem directed more at end-users than at implementers and as such they may not belong in the standard at all.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
194	Kearney	0	15	PID Use and Definition
Comment				
This section contains the definition for every FTC PID, but the text in Section 15 only mentions FTC_NEGOTIATE. Either a brief summary of the other PIDs should be included here, or the existing text should be put under a subsection related only to FTC_NEGOTIATE.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
195	Newton	0	15	
Comment				
"In order to best understand this procedure, this standard describes the GET first." - Remove. In the other documents GETs are described before SETS.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
196	Blair	0	15	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments. The section title should be "FTC Parameter Messages"				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
197	Blair	0	15	PID Use and Definition
Comment				
Again, a flowchart for the PID's is REALLY needed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
198	Newton	0	15*	
Comment				
I'd suggest ordering the PIDs: FTC_STATUS, FTC_NEGOTIATE, FTC_TRANSFER, FTC_VALIDATE, FTC_COMMIT, FTC_CANCEL.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
199	Newton	0	15*	PID Use and Definition
Comment				
Having made it through all the PIDs it's clear we need clean separation between PIDs that fetch or modify data (LAMP_HOURS, DISPLAY_LEVEL, FTC_STATUS) and those that perform actions (CLEAR_STATUS, CAPTURE_PRESET, RECORD_SENSORS, FTC_VALIDATE, FTC_COMMIT etc.) . A PID should not be used to both manipulate data and trigger actions.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
200	Nigrosh	0	15.1	
Comment				
<p>Obtain Transfer Details and Status (uses GET:FTC_NEGOTIATE) Though some of the characters in FTC_TQS_UPLOAD and FTC_TQS_DOWNLOAD seem to combine into English words, they are merely variables in this document and, thus, the reader does not know what is "appropriate" as a response to GET or SET FTC_TRANSFER. This could be written to state "Once a responder has successfully processed a SET:FTC_TRANSFER or GET:FTC_TRANSFER PID, it shall return FTC_TQS_UPLOAD if it is in an upload state or FTC_TQS_DOWNLOAD if it is in a download state."</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
201	Newton	0	15.1	Obtain Transfer Details and Status (uses
Comment				
<p>"Responders shall only expect a data transfer after receipt of the SET command." - Remove this section is describing the GET not the SET</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
202	Blair	0	15.2	
Comment				
<p>Section title is confusing. To be consistent with all other documents the section title should be the PID name: "FTC Negotiate (FTC_NEGOTIATE)"</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
203	Blair	0	15.1	
Comment				
<p>The organization is getting super confusing to me. Everything in this section starts off with "This PID..." but the PID isn't actually defined until Section 15.1.1. There are lots of forward reference issues here. It would be much easier to follow if all the PID's are defined before you get into the specifics of what is declared in 15.1.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		<p>Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.</p>		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
204	Newton	0	15.1	
Comment				
<p>"A Responder that is not currently processing a transfer shall return a response status of FTC_TQS_IDLE. A responder that has been issued a SET:FTC_NEGOTIATE, but has not yet received any SET:FTC_TRANSFER messages shall return a response FTC_TQS_NEGOTIATE. Once a responder has successfully processed a SET:FTC_TRANSFER or GET:FTC_TRANSFER PID it shall return FTC_TQS_UPLOAD or FTC_TQS_DOWNLOAD as appropriate."</p> <p>This should be split out because it's discussing the state machine on the responder side. It's important enough that it shouldn't be buried in the description of a GET.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		<p>Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.</p>		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
205	Blair	0	15.x	
Comment				
<p>All PID diagrams. The line weighting is not consistent.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		<p>Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.</p>		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
206	Blair	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
Again there are issues with the Style for section headings as level 3 should not have a smaller text for heading than the body text.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
207	Newton	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
Session ID "This shall be set to 0x00" . If it's always set to 0 it should be removed from the message.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
208	Kearney	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
If the Session ID field is always set to 0x00, it does not need to be present in the PD.				
I'm also a bit confused about the presence of FileID in the GET form of this message; if a given responder can only be transferring one file at a time (as stated in Sect. 11), and it reports the ID of that file in the GET_RESPONSE, what meaning does this field have in the controller's GET? This should be clarified, or the field should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
209	Kearney	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
Missing period at end of 'Session ID' data description.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
210	Newton	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
"Response Data A responder shall set this to 0x0000" - remove, has no purpose.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
211	Newton	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
"current file offset" - replace with "current transfer offset".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
212	Newton	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
Much of the field descriptions are restatements of section 6. Remove the duplication and move all literals to constants.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
213	Newton	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
Packet CRC - it's confusing to include a CRC here. Why is this get response message different from any other RDM message?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
214	Newton	0	15.1.1	
Comment				
<p>The GET & SET for FTC_NEGOTIATE are unrelated - the GET is reading DATA whereas the SET is triggering an action. Grouping them into a single PID is confusing. In the rest of the RDM docs we used a combined GET / SET to read / write the same data.</p> <p>I'd suggest separating this into a separate PID called FTC_STATUS or similar. This is consistent with E1.20 e.g. SENSOR_DEFINITION & RECORD_SENSORS.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
215	Nigrosh	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
<p>It says that "Controllers should use this PID to ascertain the capabilities of a responder prior to initiating a transfer using the corresponding SET:, or to monitor transfer progress.", but the GET_RESPONSE is coming from a responder. Perhaps this text could be moved to the GET request preceding this section?</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
216	Kearney	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
<p>File size should be included in the GET_RESPONSE data, to provide more information about the transfer currently in progress.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
217	Blair	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
<p>Why are the get responses different sections from the get? This is inconsistent with all other RDM family docs and is part of what is making it more confusing to follow here.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
218	Blair	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
Parameter Data table isn't rendering properly.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
219	Blair	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
Data Offset should just be stated as 32-bit in the table. It is confusing showing it as 2 16bit fields. We have 32-bit fields in the other documents.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
220	Blair	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
Response Data, File ID, Capabilites, Accumulated Packet count, and probably others are not shown with "(16-bit)" in the table.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
221	Kearney	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
If the Response Data field is always set to 0x0000, it does not need to be present in the PD.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
222	Kearney	0	15.1.2	Responder: Reply to obtain transfer Det
Comment				
Par. 2 (underneath figure)] Awkward phrasing, suggest rephrase to '...as that returned for a SET_RESPONSE to a SET:FTC_NEGOTIATE message (detailed in Section 15.2.1), with the following...'. Also, perhaps the order of sect. 15.1 and 15.2 should be swapped to avoid a forward reference here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
223	Kearney	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
In the data description, a Valid Range should be displayed for either all fields or none, for consistency. Harmonize the formatting in this section between the descriptions of different fields.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
224	Blair	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
Data Offset 2nd and 3rd para. Re-phrase to make less wordy.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
225	Kearney	0	5.1.2, DataOffse	
Comment				
The standard should be more clear about what length the offset represents in the response. Suggest: 'This should equate to the offset sent by the controller in the last SET:FTC_TRANSFER command plus the length of the data included in that command.'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
226	Blair	0	15.1.2	
Comment				
Delays: times should be mS not ms				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
227	Blair	0	15.2, para 4	Negotiate and Initiate Transfer
Comment				
Why do we have this para? We shouldn't have to say that a PID gets ACK'd.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
228	Nigrosh	0	15.2	
Comment				
Negotiate and Initiate Transfer (uses SET:FTC_NEGOTIATE) The second to last paragraph could be rewritten to state that "Responders that are rejecting a transfer negotiate request for more than one issue shall only reply with the Reason Code with the lowest numerical value out of all of the applicable Reason Codes."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
229	Blair	0	15.2	
Comment				
Reference to Table A-4 should be linked as a bookmark.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
230	Kearney	0	15.2, para 9	
Comment				
This paragraph/requirement should be removed. The use of a proxy may require the use of ACK_TIMER, and because of the nature of most proxy behavior, from the Controller's perspective the ACK_TIMER will appear to be coming from the end responder. In fact, Section 3.2 of this standard acknowledges this. This paragraph could thus be problematic if Controller designers take it to mean that they don't need to expect ACK_TIMER responses.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
231	Blair	0	5.2 last paragraph	
Comment				
Should more simply state that "Responders shall not use ACK_TIMER with this message."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
232	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
Controller : SET Request to Negotiate File Transfer: It is unclear why File Size needs to be two separate 16-bit fields and not just a single 32-bit field.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
233	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
File Size in table should just be shown as 32-bits and in the text below.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
234	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
File Data should just be represented in the table as 16 bytes of File Data as a single field the same way we would show a text field.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
235	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
FileID, FileCRC and PacketCRC should say "(16-bit)" in the table.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
236	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
SessionID. reference to Section 8 should be bookmarked in Word to link properly.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
237	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
FileID. 0x0000 should be a define.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
238	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
"PID" should be "Parameter Message" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
239	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
File Data. Why is 16 bytes the arbitrary limit instead of 8 or 32 bytes? 32 bytes would be much more useful for this purpose. There are many PIDs in RDM that are larger than 16 bytes of payload.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
240	Blair	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
"Responders that do not verify suitability of the data using this method are free to reject data transfers at any time during the upload process." Suggest rewording as if-then. "If a responder determines the file data isn't applicable then....."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
241	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
The image should show the file size as a 32 bit field, not two 16 bit fields. Similarly for the data - show a 16byte block, not individual values. New				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
242	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
"For firmware uploads a controller shall set the FileID to 0x0000." - the term "firmware" isn't defined. What if I have different firmware for the RDM microcontroller vs the NIC ? They can't both be 0x0000.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
243	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
"The 16byte limit in the negotiate stage is to satisfy the requirements of memory limited responders. The overall size of this PID (PDL plus RDM header) is designed to be less than 64bytes. This allows for responders which can only support small RDM packets to use this standard. While some manufacturers may wish more data to be transferred, there is nothing in this standard that prevents manufacturers of responders rejecting the data transfer after actual transfer has commenced. "				
Remove all this text - we don't need to justify it - that's what public review comments are for.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
244	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
Replace "file size" with "transfer size".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
245	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
It's not clear how to differentiate between an upload and a download. Is it inferred from the file size field ?				
What if I want to delete a file ?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
246	Newton	0	15.2.1	
Comment				
File Data (16 bytes) - what if the transfer is <16 bytes? Is this 0 padded?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
247	Nigrosh	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
Responder : Generic response It is unclear that the box diagram shown in this subsection is meant to be applied to all of the 15.2.2.x subsubsections. Adding some text would be helpful, though it may also be beneficial to put the entirety of the box diagram into each subsubsection.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
248	Newton	0	15.2.2*	
Comment				
[TSM note: No text was provided by Newton. Entry simply says, "15.2.2.*"]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
249	Blair	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
See previous comments about section titles for PIDs.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
250	Blair	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
See previous comments about "(16-bit)" in table and Data/File size being shown as 32-bit field.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
251	Blair	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
FileID. 0xFFFF should be a define.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
252	Blair	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
FileID "and or" should be "and/or" [TSM note: "And/or" is bad writing. See clause 4.2.4 in ESTA's Manual of Style, available at http://tsp.esta.org/tsp/documents/procedural_docs.html .]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
253	Blair	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
Delays: times should be mS not ms.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
254	Blair	0	15.2.2	
Comment				
headers for each of the fields is inconsistent with showing (8bit) (8 bit) (16bit) (16-bit). I've noticed this throughout the document. The style for all the RDM family docs has always been to use (8-bit), (16-bit), etc...				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
255	Kearney	0	15.2.2.1	
Comment				
Response Status and Response Data descriptions have a few missing periods.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
256	Kearney	0	15.2.2.1FileID	
Comment				
If the FileID is unsupported, the responder should be sending an RDNRC_UNSUPPORTED_FILEID response instead of ACKOK, right? So, the text about setting the FileID to 0xFFFF if unsupported doesn't make sense here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
257	Nigrosh	0	15.2.2.2	
Comment				
Responder : Negotiate Fail : Error in Packet CRC The note in red should be labeled as informative or, better still, removed from this document.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
258	Blair	0	15.2.2.2	
Comment				
Style for level 4 Section headings is smaller than body text and much smaller than field heading font size. The heading styles should be set to match the rest of the RDM family of documents.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
259	Kearney	0	15.2.2.2	
Comment				
Remove the paragraph with informal language in italics; it looks more like an internal comment.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
260	Nigrosh	0	15.2.2.4	
Comment				
Responder : Negotiate Fail : Reject due to E1.37 Lock Mechanism. Suggest removing the "E1.37" from the subsubsection title and the NACK Reason Code, and using a normative reference to the E1.37 standard instead.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
261	Blair	0	15.2.2.4	
Comment				
This text should specifically reference the LOCK PID define value in Section xxx of [PIDS-1].				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
262	Blair	0	15.2.2.4	Responder: Negotiate Fail.... Lock Mech
Comment				
"Controllers in receipt of this response are advised to provide some means of" Suggest: "Controllers receiving this response should..." Reason: clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
263	Blair	0	15.3.1	
Comment				
0xFF should be a define.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
264	Kearney	0	15.3.1	Controller: SET request to Cancel
Comment				
FileID is also unnecessary here if a responder can only support one transfer at a time. See comment for 15.1.1.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
265	Nigrosh	0	15.3.2	
Comment				
Responder : Generic SET Response It is unclear that the box diagram shown in this subsection is meant to be applied to all of the 15.2.3.x subsubsections. Adding some text would be helpful, though it may also be beneficial to put the entirety of the box diagram into each subsubsubsection.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
266	Blair	0	15.3.2	
Comment				
PD table not rendering correctly. See other comments about using "(16-bit)".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
267	Newton	0	15.3.2.2	
Comment				
"Error in PacketCRC", I don't see how this is possible because there is no Packet CRC in the request.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
268	Kearney	0	15.3.2.2	
Comment				
This section makes reference to a PacketCRC field that is not present in the command.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
269	Blair	0	15.3.2.3	
Comment				
How is "actioned" here different from "confirmed" in the previous section?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
270	Nigrosh	0	5.3.2.3 [15.7.2.2]	Responder : Cancel request : Error in Se
Comment				
<p>Responder : Cancel request : Error in SessionID</p> <p>The intent of the sentence "The controller may resend the request with the required SessionID" is unclear. From this message, the controller does not know what "the required SessionID" is. Suggest removing this text, or creating an informative note that captures the actual intent.</p> <p>What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply? The controller cancels after three attempts. Perhaps that same logic applies to the responder?</p> <p>FTC_NRC_STREAM_ID_MISMATCH is not defined in this standard.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
271	Kearney	0	15.3.2.3	
Comment				
FTC_NRC_STREAM_ID_MISMATCH: shouldn't this be SESSION_ID? There is no reference anywhere else to a "Stream ID".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
272	Blair	0	15.3.2.3	
Comment				
0xFF should be a define.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
273	Nigrosh	0	15.3.2.4	
Comment				
<p>Responder : Cancel request : Error in FileID</p> <p>The intent of the sentence "The controller may resend the request with the required FileID" is unclear. From this message, the controller does not know what "the required FileID" is. Suggest removing this text, or creating an informative note that captures the actual intent.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
274	Kearney	0	15.3.2.4	
Comment				
Remove gap in the middle of 'FTC_NRC_UNSUPPORTED_FILEID'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
275	Kearney	0	15.4	
Comment				
'This command' should be replaced with 'SET:FTC_VALIDATE' for clarity at the beginning of this section.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
276	Blair	0	15.4	
Comment				
"minimize" is spelled incorrectly.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
277	Nigrosh	0	15.4.1	
Comment				
Controller : SET Request to Validate Transfer The box diagram does not show a PacketCRC field, yet the Data Description includes one and subsubsection 15.4.2.2 references it.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
278	Blair	0	15.4.1	
Comment				
FileID should state "(16-bit)" in the table.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
279	Blair	0	15.4.1	
Comment				
See previous comments about consistent usage (8-bit) (16-bit) in field headings.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
280	Newton	0	15.4.1	
Comment				
PacketCRC isn't shown in the image (and PDL is set to 3) yet the PacketCRC field is described.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
281	Kearney	0	15.4.1	
Comment				
The PacketCRC data field is missing from the figure.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
282	Blair	0	15.4.2	
Comment				
Table not rendered properly in PDF. See previous comments about using (16-bit).				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
283	Kearney	0	15.4.2	
Comment				
Remove duplicate text before or after figure.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
284	Nigrosh	0	15.4.2.2	
Comment				
Responder : Validate Request : Error in PacketCRC What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply? The controller cancels after three attempts. Perhaps that same logic applies to the responder?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
285	Newton	0	15.4.2.2	
Comment				
"Error in PacketCRC", I don't see how this is possible because there is no Packet CRC in the request.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
286	Kearney	0	15.4.2.5	
Comment				
FTC_NRC_STREAM_ID_MISMATCH: see comment for 15.3.2.3				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
287	Nigrosh	0	15.4.2.5	
Comment				
Responder : Validate Request : Error in SessionID FTC_NRC_STREAM_ID_MISMATCH is not defined in this standard.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
288	Nigrosh	0	15.4.2.5	
Comment				
What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply? The controller cancels after three attempts. Perhaps that same logic applies to the responder?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
289	Nigrosh	0	15.4.2.8	
Comment				
Responder : Validate Request : Any other reason This appears to be a copy and paste of everything but the first paragraph of the previous subsubsection. Should there be a distinct Response Data value?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
290	Blair	0	15.4.3	
Comment				
See comment #130. [Blair's comment #130 is: "Table not rendered properly in PDF. See previous comments about using (16-bit)."]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
291	Blair	0	15.4.3	
Comment				
There is no text for the fields in the Data Description???				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
292	Nigrosh	0	15.4.3	
Comment				
Controller : GET Request to Validate Transfer There is no text for either of the fields that appear in the Data Description section.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
293	Kearney	0	15.4.3	
Comment				
Text is missing in the data description.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
294	Blair	0	15.4.4	
Comment				
See comment #130. [Blair's comment #130 is: "Table not rendered properly in PDF. See previous comments about using (16-bit)."]				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
295	Blair	0	15.4.4.1	
Comment				
typo. "...that is has been..."				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
296	Nigrosh	0	15.4.4.3	
Comment				
Responder : Validate Request : Result not available yet What should the controller do if, as suggested by the last paragraph, the responder replies with unexpected Response Data?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
297	Kearney	0	.4.3, last paragr	
Comment				
Replace 'only be replying with either' with 'reply with one of' or similar for better formal language.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
298	Nigrosh	0	15.5	
Comment				
Commit Data (uses SET:FTC_COMMIT) The third paragraph suggests that Modal errors are described in 15.5.2.3. However, Missing Validation is described there. It seems like Missing Validation is correct for this situation.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
299	Blair	0	15.5.1	
Comment				
See previous comments about using (16-bit) in table and consistent usage in text.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
300	Nigrosh	0	15.5.1	
Comment				
Controller : SET Request to Commit Data The Data Description area indicates a PacketCRC field, but this is not reflected in the box diagram.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
301	Kearney	0	15.5.1	
Comment				
The PacketCRC data field is missing from the figure.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
302	Blair	0	15.5.2	
Comment				
Table not rendered properly in PDF. See previous comments about using (16-bit).				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
303	Blair	0	15.5.2	
Comment				
Section heading should include the PID name in it: i.e. "FTC Commit Set Response (FTC_COMMIT)"				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
304	Blair	0	15.5.2	
Comment				
References to RDM UID changing are concerning.				
I consider it very bad form for a firmware update the change a UID.				
It increases the likelihood of duplicate UID's and makes it impossible for the controller to track devices.				
I'm not doubting there are some devices out there that do this, but I strongly feel that we should not be enshrining it and effectively encouraging the practice in this document.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
305	Nigrosh	0	15.5.2.2	
Comment				
Responder : Commit Data Request : Error in PacketCRC				
What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply? The controller cancels after three attempts. Perhaps that responder could do four?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
306	Nigrosh	0	15.5.2.3	
Comment				
Responder : Commit Data Request : Missing Validation Request What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply? What about seven times? I like seven.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
307	Blair	0	5.2.4, paragrap	
Comment				
This para, especially the 2nd sentence is very cumbersome reading. Needs rephrasing to be more direct.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
308	Nigrosh	0	15.5.2.4	
Comment				
Responder : Commit Data Request : Modal Error The difference between Modal Error and Missing Validation Request need to be made more clear. What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
309	Nigrosh	0	15.5.2.5	
Comment				
Responder : Commit Data Request : Error in SessionID What counts as "repeatedly" sending this reply? The controller cancels after three attempts. Perhaps that same logic applies to the responder?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
310	Blair	0	d all other simil	
Comment				
"...in accordance with section 15.3 of this standard." We can eliminate "of this standard." in all places it occurs as it is redundant. It is assumed to be a section in this document unless otherwise stated.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
311	Nigrosh	0	15.5.2.7	
Comment				
Responder : Commit Data Request : Validation Failure It is unclear why a generic failure (15.5.2.9) isn't acceptable for this behaviour. We cannot cater to every misbehaving piece of equipment. Suggest striking this entirely.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
312	Blair	0	15.5.3	Controller: GET request to Commit Dat
Comment				
What section of [RDM] is this referencing. This is not an E1.20 NACK code it is an E1.37-4 code. Is the PID supposed to get NACK'd using the normal RDM NACK code or is it supposed to get ACK'd and then use this new code in Response Status? I believe you meant to use NR_UNSUPPORTED_COMMAND_CLASS from [RDM] but you need to specify from Table A-14 in [RDM] and reference Section 6.3.4 of [RDM].				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
313	Blair	0	15.6 [15.4]	Transfer Data (GET/SET FTC_TRANS
Comment				
This should use the proper defines for SET_COMMAND and GET_COMMAND. SET and GET alone are not defined.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
314	Newton	0	15.6 [15.4]	Transfer Data (GET/SET FTC_TRANS
Comment				
<p>"Responders may choose to reject a SET command if it is received before a SET: FTC_NEGOTIATE has been processed by the responder."</p> <p>The further in to the document I got the more I was convinced we should describe this more formally as a state machine rather than "X occurs before Y" . It's hard to keep track of the ordering of the events.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
315	Blair	0	15.6 [15.4]	Transfer Data (GET/SET FTC_TRANS
Comment				
The proper define is NR_UNSUPPORTED_COMMAND_CLASS and should reference the section in [RDM].				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
316	Blair	0	15.6.1 [15.4.1]	
Comment				
See previous comments about "(16-bit)" in table and Data/File size being shown as 32-bit field.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
317	Newton	0	15.6.1	
Comment				
Same comment about 32 bit fields.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
318	Blair	0	15.6.1 [15.4.1]	
Comment				
Section heading should include the PID name in it as mentioned in previous comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
319	Blair	0	15.6.1	
Comment				
"Block Size" isn't this field the "Max Block Size" in the Negotiate PID?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
320	Blair	0	15.6.1 [15.4.1]	
Comment				
Section 8 reference is not properly bookmarked in Word.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
321	Blair	0	15.6.1 [15.4.1]	
Comment				
Data: It says it "may be the Max Block Size". This phrasing also means it could be smaller OR could even be larger. This probably needs to be a SHOULD and needs to state "up to Max Block Size".				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
322	Blair	0	15.6.2	
Comment				
Section heading should include the PID name in it as mentioned in previous comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
323	Blair	0	5.6.2 [15.4.1.1]	
Comment				
Table not rendered properly in PDF. See previous comments about using (16-bit). Again, line weights in all the PIDs are inconsistent.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
324	Blair	0	5.6.2 [15.4.1.1]	
Comment				
Responder : Generic Response It is not clear that this box diagram applies also to the subsubsubsections beneath it. Additional text, or repetition of the box diagram, would be helpful.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
325	Kearney	0	5.6.2.1 [15.4.1.1]	
Comment				
The "length of data stored" text ambiguity should be fixed here as well, see similar command on Sect. 15.1.2.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
326	Newton	0	5.6.2.2 [15.4.1.2]	
Comment				
" 100ms is considered too coarse for timely upload of data that may require less than 10ms" 10ms or 100ms ? Regard remove the literal values and reference RDM.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
327	Nigrosh	0	5.6.2.3 [15.4.1.4]	
Comment				
Responder : Data rejected : Resend Packet It is not clear from the Response Data description that there are specific times when either of the two codes should be used. It seems as though FTC_RDNRC_PACKET_CRC_ERROR should only be sent in the case of a CRC error, but the current writing does not preclude it from being used for other, more generic, errors.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
328	Blair	0	5.6.2.4 [15.4.1.8]	
Comment				
Response Data options should be listed as a bulleted list for reability.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
329	Newton	0	15.6.3 [15.4.2]	
Comment				
We go to great lengths to support responders that can't support the max packet size but not controllers. Consider adding a "block size" in the request or providing some other way for the controller to limit how much data is returned.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
330	Blair	0	15.6.3	
Comment				
Should be "message" instead of "PID" as noted in other comments.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
331	Blair	0	15.6.1	
Comment				
See previous comments about DataOffset being shown as 32-bit field				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
332	Blair	0	15.6.3	
Comment				
it should also mention that if there is a missing response it can re-request the same packet again.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
333	Blair	0	15.6.3.1	
Comment				
See previous comments about "(16-bit)" in table and Data/File size being shown as 32-bit field.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
334	Blair	0	15.6.3.1	
Comment				
PD table shows an empty 8-bit cell on the top row.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
335	Blair	0	5.6.3.2 [15.4.2.2]	
Comment				
PID table not rendered properly.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
336	Blair	0	15.7 [15.8]	
Comment				
"This PID..." should be "The FTC_PROXY_CAPABILITIES parameter message..." multiple instances.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
337	Kearney	0	15.7.2 [15.8.2]	
Comment				
It's not clear what meaning Accumulated Packet Count, Accumulated Packet Delay and Commit Delay have in the context of a proxy device, since these parameters are related to the processing of a file received by a responder. This should be clarified or those fields should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
338	Blair	0	15.7.2	
Comment				
Table not rendered properly. Inconsistent use of "(16-bit)" for all 16 bit fields.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
339	Blair	0	15.8	
Comment				
"This PID..." should be "The FTC_FILELIST parameter message..." multiple instances.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
340	Newton	0	15.8 [15.9]	
Comment				
"Responders that only support firmware upload (and not firmware download) are not required to implement this PID." Suggest changing to "Responders that do not support firmware download are not required ... "				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
341	Kearney	0	15.8	
Comment				
'Responders that only support firmware upload (and not firmware download) are not required to implement this PID.' There is an implication in this sentence that the inverse is true, i.e. that responders that do support firmware download ARE required to implement the PID. Is that true? The standard should be clear.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
342	Newton	0	15.8	
Comment				
It feels like an 8-bit field isn't going to be sufficient given the level of detail we're defining file types.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
343	Nigrosh	0	15.8.1	
Comment				
Controller Request for File List. If File Types may be added to, will that prompt a rewriting of this document? If so, the line about them being added to, "from time to time," is unnecessary, because the list of types will always be current as to the revision of the document it appears in. If they are not to be added to this document, then there needs to be an explanation of how they can be added and where that information appears.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
344	Blair	0	15.8.1	
Comment				
Table not rendered properly.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
345	Blair	0	15.8.1	
Comment				
Table A-7 not bookmarked properly in Word.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
346	Blair	0	15.8.1	
Comment				
All instances of FTC_TYP_ALL should be FTC_TYPE_ALL for better clarity.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
347	Kearney	0	15.8.1 end	
Comment				
Missing period at end of last sentence.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
348	Nigrosh	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
Responder : Reply with File List Since this PID can OVERFLOW, the "(Message Count)" field should be "0x00 - 0xFF" and not 0x00 as it appears.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
349	Kearney	0	15.8.1.1FileID	
Comment				
'Responders may elect to report FileID 0x0000 under File Type FTC_TYP_FIRMWARE in this list.' Suggest that this be more prescriptive to encourage predictable responder design; for example: 'If a responder supports firmware transfer, it shall report FileID 0x0000 with File Type FTC_TYPE_FIRMWARE in this list.'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
350	Kearney	0	.1.1FileID, para	
Comment				
Missing word: 'it shall report a FileID even if there <are> not yet any file data stored within the responder'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
351	Blair	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
The text should note that the response is a repeating structure...				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
352	Blair	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
See previous comments about "(16-bit)" in table and Data/File size being shown as 32-bit field.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
353	Newton	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
Similar comment to the one above - don't split the 32 bit fields.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
354	Blair	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
Table A-6 not bookmarked properly in Word.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
355	Newton	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
Incorrect table reference - should be A-7.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
356	Blair	0	15.8.1.1	
Comment				
Add section reference to ACK_OVERFLOW in [RDM].				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
357	Nigrosh	0	15.9.1	
Comment				
<p>Controller Request for FileType Description</p> <p>If File Types may be added to, will that prompt a rewriting of this document? If so, the line about them being added to, "from time to time," is unnecessary, because the list of types will always be current as to the revision of the document it appears in. If they are not to be added to this document, then there needs to be an explanation of how they can be added and where that information appears.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
358	Nigrosh	0	9.1.1 [15.10.1.	
Comment				
<p>Responder: Reply with FileType Descriptive Text</p> <p>A PDL of 0x21 does not allow for 32 characters of Kanji. Many unicode runes take more than one octet to describe. Will this support UTF-8? There's no reason why a new PID shouldn't be able to do so. Even if it remains limited to 32 characters, there are no extant runes that would overflow this beyond the maximum allowable PDL for a single packet. It seems shortsighted for this to be ASCII only. If that does seem the route, this section should at least reference the text descriptions section of the RDM standard, which, it has been mentioned, may eventually be modified to accommodate UTF-8.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
359	Newton	0	15.9.1	
Comment				
Fix the table reference, A-7 not A-6				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
360	Nigrosh	0	15.10.1.1	
Comment				
<p>Responder: Reply with FileID Descriptive Text</p> <p>A PDL of 0x22 does not allow for 32 characters of the pickle emoji. Many unicode runes take more than one octet to describe. Will this support UTF-8? There's no reason why a new PID shouldn't be able to do so. Even if it remains limited to 32 characters, there are no extant runes that would overflow this beyond the maximum allowable PDL for a single packet. It seems shortsighted for this to be ASCII only. If that does seem the route, this section should at least reference the text descriptions section of the RDM standard, which, it has been mentioned, may eventually be modified to accommodate UTF-8.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
361	Blair	0	A, Appendix A	
Comment				
All Table Names need to be added as "Table Captions" in Word for Bookmarks to all work properly.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
362	Blair	0	A, Appendix A	
Comment				
all tables: rephrase to avoid use of "in respect of" to make clearer.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
363	Kearney	0	A, Table A-1	
Comment				
Often we use draft or prototyping PID values to help with proof-of-concept implementations; has that been considered for this standard?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
364	Kearney	0	A, Table A-2	
Comment				
text above table: Incomplete sentence.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
365	Nigrosh	0	A, Table A-2	
Comment				
It would be helpful if the meaning of these codes were defined.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
366	Kearney	0	A, Table A-2	
Comment				
FTC_RS_IDLE is not mentioned anywhere else in the document. It should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
367	Nigrosh	0	A, Table A-3	
Comment				
It would be helpful if the meaning of these codes were defined.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
368	Kearney	0	A, Table A3	
Comment				
FTC_RS_IDLE is not mentioned anywhere else in the document. It should be removed.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
369	Blair	0	A, Table A3	Use of Response Data Field
Comment				
I'm confused by Table A-3. It is not listing defines, but instead different usage instances of the defines. This would be clearer if this table was in the section where it is relevant...or combine with the Table above into a single table.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
370	Newton	0	A, Table A3	
Comment				
Not sure what "URS" means.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
371	Nigrosh	0	A, Table A-4	
Comment				
FTC_TQS_UNKNOWN is not defined				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
372	Blair	0	A, TableA-5	
Comment				
"E137" is not the proper reference. Should use specific PID defines and proper doc reference.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
373	Kearney	0	Table A-5 [A-	
Comment				
Clarify the usage of FTC_RDNRC_INTERNAL_ERROR. When exactly is it sent by the responder? Does it apply to FileCRC in the same way that PACKET_CRC_ERROR applies to PacketCRC? This may require text changes elsewhere in the document.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
374	Blair	0	A, Table A-6	
Comment				
If these are adding to the [RDM] list of NR codes then it needs to follow the same naming scheme prefix. i.e: NR_FTC_SESSION_ID_MISMATCH.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
375	Kearney	0	A, Table A-6	
Comment				
These NACK reason codes match exactly with two codes in Table A-5. Why is there a mixture of the existing RDM NACK functionality and the more granular Response Status and Response Data fields contained within an ACK response? I understand the need for more data included with a NACK, but I think the standard should settle on one method to NACK things. If this is always Response Status and Response Data, then so be it.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
376	Blair	0	A, Table A-7	
Comment				
Suggest making these all "TYPE" instead of "TYP" to make it a bit more readable.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
377	Kearney	0	A, Table A-7	
Comment				
There needs to be an option for file types that do not fit into this list of categories. Also, a manufacturer-specific range would be nice.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
378	Nigrosh	0	A, Table A-7	
Comment				
It would be helpful if the meaning of these codes were defined. What do the things about the bits mean?				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
379	Blair	0	B, Appendix B	
Comment				
Appendix B examples are misnumbered.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
380	Kearney	0	B, Appendix B	
Comment				
Fix section numbering, B-1 appears twice.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
381	Kearney	0	Appendix Bexample	
Comment				
Suggest that the text "Controller sends Negotiate Request using SET_FTC_NEGOTIATE" be included in the first step of all relevant examples, for clarity. Example B-1 has this, but subsequent ones omit the explicit mention of SET_FTC_NEGOTIATE.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
382	Nigrosh	0	B, Appendix B	
Comment				
The label "Example B-1" appears for the examples both before and after Example B-2.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
383	Kearney	0	B, Example B-1	
Comment				
Note 4: extra space and missing article here: 'may have new features and/or <a> new UID.'				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
384	Kearney	0	B, Example B-2	
Comment				
Note 3: Missing period at end of sentence.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
385	Kearney	0	B, Example B-3	
Comment				
Note 1: Missing period at end of sentence.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
386	Blair	0	β, Appendix B-I	
Comment				
I read the entire document and was confused most of the time because there was never any kind of flowchart overview of the entire process. A simplified version of this needs to be presented as a proper flow chart early on and then reference Appendix B for the full details of every case.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Flowchart added to Operational Overview section		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
387	Blair	0	β, Appendix B-I	
Comment				
This needs a bit of formatting work as it is a bit hard to read as currently formatted.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
388	Nigrosh	0	C, Example C-1	
Comment				
Suggest striking the note "In this case a responder may still have more data if the file size was incorrectly reported." It is not necessary to explain every case where one or more of the components has failed to function correctly. If it does seem important, perhaps a better place is in the text of the standard, rather than this example in the appendix, where we are otherwise assuming everything working as intended.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
389	Kearney	0	C, Example C-2	
Comment				
FTC_NRC_UNSUPPORTED_FILEID seems like the wrong reason for "DataOffset beyond end of file". A new reason is needed here.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
390	Kearney	0	pendix Cexamp	
Comment				
Suggest that the text "Controller sends Negotiate Request using SET_FTC_NEGOTIATE" be included in the first step of all relevant examples, for clarity. Example B-1 has this, but subsequent ones omit the explicit mention of SET_FTC_NEGOTIATE.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
391	Kearney	0	D, Example D-1	
Comment				
Suggest that the text "Controller sends Negotiate Request using SET_FTC_NEGOTIATE" be included in the first step of all relevant examples, for clarity. Example B-1 has this, but subsequent ones omit the explicit mention of SET_FTC_NEGOTIATE.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
392	Kearney	0	D, Example D-1	
Comment				
Note 3: First word should be capitalized.				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
393	Nigrosh	0	F, Appendix F	
Comment				
<p>There is an error in the first set of arithmetic: $176\text{us Break} + 12\text{us MAB} + ((25 + 231) * 44)\text{us} =$ $176 + 12 + ((25 + 231) * 44) =$ $188 + ((256) * 44) =$ $188 + 11264 =$ 11452 $11452\text{ us} \neq 11.22\text{ms}$</p> <p>The error in the first round of math propagates to the estimate of the best case total time, which should be $293 * 11.45\text{ms Tx Data} [3354.85\text{ms}] + (293 * 1.420\text{ms Rx Data}) [416.06\text{ms}] + \text{System delay} [51.6\text{ms}]$ which gives approximately 3822.51ms</p> <p>The error in the first round of math continues on to the estimate of the transfer time, which should be 4640.11ms</p> <p>The calculation for the transfer of a 4GB file is incorrect, as well, given the earlier error, and the fact that only 224 of the parameter data octets contain file data.</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		

Comment #	CommentorID	Commentor's #	Section	Section Title
394	Nigrosh	0	G, Appendix G	
Comment				
<p>This whole section, while attempting to clarify the CRC concept, merely makes it more confusing. It may make sense to reference another document that can describe this with more clarity, or it may be necessary to rework this appendix.</p> <p>The assertion that a CRC polynomial has "n + 1 terms" is confusing, especially since the E1.37-4 chosen polynomial does not have n + 1 terms unless zeroes are used as the coefficient for many of them. This could be clarified by calling out the 0 coefficients, or it could be rewritten to state "a maximum of n + 1 terms."</p> <p>What a "remainder" is, in this instance, is not clear, as remainders are not found when only addition and raising to a power are performed. That division modulo 2 is being done is only found referenced in one offhand comment in Section 9.</p> <p>CRC-16-CCITT should have a normative reference</p>				
Resolution		Resolution Comments		
No Action		Thank you for your comment. The WorkingGroup has decided to completely revise the approach taken to this standard. We look forward to your comments on a new document.		